

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application, based on the following remarks, are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, claims 16 and 19 are amended to merely clarify the recited subject matter. Claims 11-19 will be pending in this application.

Preliminarily, Applicant's representative thanks Examiner Gesesse for the personal interview conducted on April 26, 2002. In accordance with the matter discussed during that interview, Applicant responds to the outstanding rejections as follows.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 16 to remove the limitation that is the subject of the rejection. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-12, 14-16 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Ericsson et al. (U.S. 5,956,637). Claims 13, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ericsson et al. in view of Maenpaa (U.S. 5,600,705). As explained during the personal interview, Applicant traverses these rejections because Ericsson et al., analyzed individually or in combination with Maenpaa, fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the rejected claims. For example, the prior art fails to teach the claimed subject matter including transmission of the identity of the calling subscriber to the mobile services switching centre of the called subscriber with a request for routing information as recited in various variations in the rejected independent claims.

As explained during the personal interview, the invention is related to transmitting a Calling Line Identity (CLI) of subscriber A to the terminal of subscriber B so that before answering the call, the called party B knows the identity of the calling party A. The problem underlying the invention is that all networks do not support the CLI in call set-up signaling.

The office action asserted that Ericsson discloses transmitting the identity of the calling subscriber (=A) to the mobile services switching centre of the called subscriber (=B) in connection with a request for routing information, see col. 17 lines 14-19. However, this analysis is incorrect because the passage of Ericsson cited by the office action relates to Ericsson's step 1201 in which the identity of A is transmitted to the MSC serving A. In Ericsson, the inquiry for routing information is performed at step 1202, the description of which reads as follows:

When Step 1202 is completed, MSC1 knows that the B-subscriber's HLR is HLR2 and the remainder of the call setup procedure is performed as in conventional systems, i.e., in Step 1203 MSC1 asks HLR2 via connection

1124 for a roaming number to the mobile station B1 and receives the roaming number from MSC2 via connection 1125 and HLR2, as known to those of ordinary skill in the art.

Note that, assuming for arguments sake that, Ericsson's mobile station A1 corresponds to the applicant's subscriber (terminal) A and Ericsson's mobile station B1 corresponds to the applicant's subscriber (terminal) B, in either case, A or A1 is the calling party and B or B1 is the called party. Thus, in Ericsson, MSC1 serves the calling party A1 and MSC2 serves the called party B1. When Ericsson states that, in step 1203, MSC1 asks HLR2 via connection 1124 for a roaming number to the mobile station B1 and receives the roaming number from MSC2 via connection 1125 and HLR2, as known to those of ordinary skill in the art, this means only that the called party's (B1) number (identity) is transmitted to the MSC of the called party, as in any conventional roaming number inquiry.

Maenpaa fails to remedy the deficiency of Ericsson, i.e., failing to teach transmission of the identity of the calling subscriber to the mobile services switching centre of the called subscriber with a request for routing information as recited in various variations in the rejected independent claims. Thus, Applicant submits that newly presented claims 11-19 are allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: 

Christine H. McCarthy
Reg. No.: 41,844
Tel. No.: (703) 905-2143
Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

CHM
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000